trade practices and deceptive advertising. And I believe it's time we have full disclosure in sentencing. I think this is something the public very much would like to be informed of and right to know. Ladies and gentlemen, I don't disagree with that statement. I think that is an absolutely true also think that the Legislature has that same right to know when we're dealing with specific amendments What happened was that LB 529 became a consent calendar bill. It was so noncontroversial that it got that right to be on the yellow sheet for purposes of being dealt with. Senator Pirsch introduced that bill and she said that it was a clean a one-item proposal. That's word for word, verbatim from her transcript. She then went on and said on April 8th at the time that this took place there was no debate on the bill, other than the introduction by the introducer, it then advanced 20 to zero over to Select File, as often happens with consent calendar On Select File though, we moved to an amendment on and that issue again, as Senator Pirsch described and said that it was nothing new, that it...and I will read to you the transcript from that on the floor debate. It said here, it says, Senator Pirsch, she was recognized for the introduction of the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members Legislature, this is just to bring LB 529 into more conformity with what is in LB 627. This is the truth in sentencing, this provision of the additional court discretion in posing penalties for the disposition of the defendant under the juvenile code. And the other substantive change relates to situations where the court is to state whether the sentences are to be concurrent or consecutive. Again, this is nothing new. It is to put in conformance with what is contained in LB 627 which has not been on Select File yet. Thank you. Thank you, Senator Pirsch, said Speaker Baack. Any discussion? Seeing none, 26 ayes, 0 nays. The amendment is adopted. The bill was then advanced on to The bill was voice voted over onto Select File Reading. and then it was passed on Final Reading. With no discussion, it passed 37 to zero. The argument can be made, ladies and gentlemen, that, well, the amendment was there, the amendment was printed, it should have been touched on. The fact of the matter is, is that it was different than it was portrayed. don't believe that Senator Pirsch did that to deceive the body. I don't believe that. I think it was an inadvertent change but it was a major change nonetheless, and it was one that basically fostered the introduction of LB 1327. It is the one that gave the...